

These words were said only where he considered the recipient's hand significant – הני מילי היכא דאחשבה לידיה

Overview:

The גמרא states that if רבי יוחנן would have said only the דין that ידו של אדם states, we might have thought that it applies only when there was a specific intention to place the object on the hand¹, however where there would be no specific intention to place it there, but rather it just happened to land on the hand, I would say that it is not considered a מקום דע"ד, therefore זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו tells us the other case where there was no intention, it just happened to land in his hand, nevertheless he is חייב, because ידו של אדם חשובה לו כדע"ד even when there is no intention. asks; let him say only the case where there is no intention, and I will surely know that the same applies when there is intention.

You may ask; let him say just this case of זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו, and he would not have to say the previous דין, that ידו של אדם חשובה לו כד' על ד' זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו, because I will know it already from the case of זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו, where there was no specific intention, and still it is considered a מקום ד' and certainly where there is an intention, so why make both statements.

we can answer that if רבי יוחנן would not have said explicitly that ידו של אדם חשובה לו כדע"ד of זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו, I would have thought

that only concerning a הנחה is a hand considered as a מקום דע"ד, since that case is only speaking about receiving an object in one's hand

but in regards to עקירה I may have thought that the hand is **not** considered a מקום דע"ד², therefore רבי יוחנן has to say explicitly that ידו של אדם חשובה לו כדע"ד in all cases whether עקירה or הנחה [and the case of זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו, lets us know that even when it's not intentional, it is still considered a מקום ד'.

Summary:

The statement ידו של אדם חשובה לו כדע"ד, teaches us that this applies both by עקירה והנחה, and the דין of זרק חפץ ונח בתוך ידו של חבריו, teaches us that it applies even if there was no specific intent to place it on the hand.

¹ See תוס' דף ד,ב ד"ה אלא א"ר יוסף

² See גמרא ד,ב ודילמא הנחה וכו' ותוס' שם ד"ה ודילמא

Thinking it over

1. Why do way say that the statement of חבירו ידו של חבירו means that there was no intent that it land חבירו של חבירו?
2. The מהר"ם asks: How can תוספות ask that רבי יוחנן should not have said the דין of כדע"ד of אדם חשובה לו כדע"ד, how would we know the reason why he is חייב, we may think that רבי יוחנן is of the opinion that a מקום ד' is not required at all?³
3. How may we differentiate between the two types of statements said by רבי יוחנן?

³ See לשון הזהב לפני אברהם